

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MARY AKU QUARTEY

*

v.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. RWT-10-1499

JERRY LANE
COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL SECURITY

*

MARY AKU QUARTEY

*

v.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. RWT-10-1509

INSPECTOR JOHN SOOS

*

MARY AKU QUARTEY

*

v.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. RWT-10-1510

J.D. JACKSON (JOSEPH MARLEY)

*

MARY AKU QUARTEY

*

v.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. RWT-10-1511

JERRY LANE

*

ORDER

On June 7, 2010, Plaintiff, who is detained at the Montgomery County Detention Center in Silver Spring, Maryland, filed the above-captioned *pro se* actions, all of which are filed on separate court forms. Each case contains fantastic claims and rambling statements which are plainly frivolous. None of the cases is accompanied by the civil filing fee or an indigency application.

This Court may preliminarily review the Complaints' allegations before service of process and dismiss them if satisfied that the Complaints have no factual or legal basis. See Neitzke v.

Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989); see also Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992); Cochran v. Morris, 73 F.3d 1310, 1314 (4th Cir. 1996); Nasim v. Warden, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995). As explained by the Supreme Court in Neitzke: "Examples of [factually baseless lawsuits] are claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios, with which federal district judges are all too familiar." 490 U.S. at 328.

Plaintiff's Complaints provide no jurisdictional or factual basis for relief. Her claims are replete with fanciful illusions. The actions shall be dismissed for the failure to state a claim and without service of process on Defendants.¹

Accordingly, it is this 15th day of June, 2010, by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, hereby ORDERED that:

1. The above-captioned cases ARE DISMISSED;
2. The Clerk SHALL CLOSE the cases; and
3. The Clerk SHALL SEND a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.

/s/
ROGER W. TITUS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff has filed approximately twenty cases in this Court since December 2, 2009. Given the frivolous nature of her filings, the Court concludes that affording Plaintiff the opportunity to amend her Complaints would be an exercise in futility.